

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

SILVER BUCKMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-00047

WARDEN, FPC Alderson,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Cheryl A. Eifert for submission of findings and recommendations regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Eifert submitted to the court her Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") on January 7, 2021, in which she recommended that the district court grant defendant's motion to dismiss, dismiss plaintiff's petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and remove this matter from the court's docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Eifert's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Buckman filed objections to the PF&R. See ECF No. 25. In those objections, she concedes that the PF&R is correct that

her petition is moot as to the 18-month provision. She argues, however, that the BOP should allow her "nearer release" transfer. Her argument is without merit. Thereafter, the defendant filed another motion to dismiss plaintiff's petition for mootness. See ECF No. 27.

Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Eifert, the court adopts the findings and recommendations contained therein. Accordingly, the court hereby **GRANTS** defendant's motions to dismiss (ECF Nos. 12 and 27); **DISMISSES** plaintiff's petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241; and directs the Clerk to remove this case from the court's active docket.


Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing

standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to plaintiff and counsel of record.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 22nd day of March, 2022.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber

Senior United States District Judge